

# THE BOSTON MORNING POST.

PUBLISHED DAILY, AT NO. 24 WATER STREET, BY BEALS & GREENE.—CHARLES GORDON GREENE, EDITOR.

VOLUME XI. NO. 90.

TUESDAY MORNING, SEPTEMBER 13, 1836.

PRICE \$6 PER ANN. IN ADVANCE.

## DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT,  
**MARTIN VAN BUREN.**  
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
**RICHARD M. JOHNSON.**

FOR ELECTORS AT LARGE  
**HON. NATHAN WILLIS, of Pittsfield.**  
**HON. SETH WHITMARSH, of Sekonk.**

FOR DISTRICT  
No 1, **ROBERT EDDY, of Boston.**  
2, **JOSEPH KITTREDGE, of Andover.**  
3, **FRANCIS TUTTLE, of Acton.**  
4, **SAMUEL TAYLOR, of Sutton.**  
5, **SAMUEL C. ALLEN, of Northfield.**  
6, **JOSEPH FITCH, of New Marlborough.**  
7, **HARVEY CHAPIN, of Springfield.**  
8, **BENJAMIN P. WILLIAMS, of Roxbury.**  
9, **NATHAN C. BROWNELL, of Westport.**  
10, **JAMES MANDELL, of New Bedford.**  
11, **JABEZ T. THOMPSON, of Halifax.**

FOR GOVERNOR,  
**MARCUS MORTON.**  
FOR LT. GOVERNOR,  
**WILLIAM FOSTER.**

FOR REPRESENTATIVE TO CONGRESS.  
FOR DISTRICT  
No 11, **HENRY CROCKER, of Barnstable.**

## AN ADDRESS

TO THE DEMOCRATIC VOTERS OF MASSACHUSETTS.

FELLOW CITIZENS.—Approaching a crisis in the fortunes of Democracy in this Commonwealth, and in a season of high, yet anxious hope, as to its success in the coming elections, National and State—the Democratic State Committee in virtue of the rules of our present organization, desire to address you.

You well know that our present organized democracy dates from the period of the amalgamation between the old school Federalists and Republicans. A union so reckless of principle, by the leaders of each section who accomplished it, assuming as they must, that those parties only existed in name, as to distrust many of our best and purest minds, and induced them to turn to the then incipient Jackson Democratic Party as the only shelter for their principles.

This was a decisive movement, and an era in our party history, and from that hour to the present, the principles and policy of each party have been gradually developed before the people, with a steadily increasing favor to democracy, and a like increasing distrust of its proud antagonist. And now, from small and most discouraging beginnings, democracy, as a political power in Massachusetts, has become formidable as a principle, embodying all that is necessary to reform and sustain our institutions, its rapid progress among us is full of the brightest hopes to the patriot and philanthropist. We say to the patriot because democracy now, as it ever has been, is his only instrument of political reform—we say to the philanthropist, because all our moral, social, and even religious reformers are beginning to learn with surprise, that the radical school democracy is the basis of their efforts, also, and that unless they are content to cultivate a true faith, but enjoy half its benefits only, the democratic party must be their home. For when its principles are well understood, it will be found a sacred duty with all citizens to carry them to the polls.

This is strikingly the case with our Anti-Masonic brethren and those reformers engaged in defence of the industrious classes and of our common rights against the encroachments of chartered wealth. These all now stand in rank with the democracy, as a political party—and ready to engage in its conflicts, and to sustain its official candidates. The consequence has been within two or three years so great an accession of numbers and power to our cause, as to confound our adversaries; and their numerous attempts at explanation, only betrays their usual ludicrous, self-conceit and consequent self-deception.

Having little conception of the power of truth on men's minds, they solve the problem by an application of their own motives of political action, and maintain that it is all from self-interest and self-seeking; that the democratic party is an unprincipled spoils of office-party, successful only by party drilling, and the machinery of patronage and place. But their assumed cause is by no means adequate for the known and quite probable cause of their success of a great nation, or one half the sane population of a State, (our relative democratic strength,) highly intelligent and prosperous, enjoying, too, the blessings of self-government, should make a business of office-seeking when each man's hope of success would hardly be as one to ten thousand! These men might as well affirm that our government itself was framed by the old patriots, and adopted by the nation, not as an institution of human benevolence, but for the emoluments of its offices.

But the great body of our party, it is said, are the honest dupes of a few adroit and successful office-holders and partisans. When will our opponents acquire the power to judge of honest motives? They themselves accuse us of an inherent and inordinate jealousy of all men in fortune's favors; and yet they would have it believed that this, our nature, only operates when it has a good constitutional whig for its object. Let them revise their lessons of human nature; and in the mean time accept our assurance that democrats, from Jefferson downwards, are jealous of executive office-holders, and of wealth-holders too, when aiming at political influence. Both positions are serious and must be watched. The people are always jealous of all political power which they cannot directly control. But their jealousy of office-holders is not from the whig motive of a longing desire to fill their places—it is a common and proper jealousy of all unequal influences which may in any degree disturb democratic equality, and thus abridge our equal rights. And this jealousy, like fear, has been wisely given, to teach us all to shun a threatened mischief. All men have it when looking upward to an imminent power, and all men in place dread it when looking downward upon those whose rights they put in hazard!

From this, also, comes the perpetual doctrine of rotation in office, and the democracy insist that in their party it shall be a perpetual practice, and not according to whig conservative notions, a perpetual theory only. All men in office, or in any elevation, will ever incline to entrench themselves and seek to perpetuate their unequal positions, and the officer they are broken up the less deep and strong will be their monuments, and the more yielding to the popular will. This is practical democracy. And does it seem to the whigs like submission to a settled dynasty of office-holders?

Democracy yield to none but popular influences. Does this look like a party under the dominion of artificial power and place?

And yet in the face of all this, we hear continually that Mr. Van Buren is the office-holder candidate. It is the richest whig theme to degrade him and one of the first lessons taught in their schools. Another, is his mysterious magical powers. Yet we cannot hope that appeals to truth or power will at all discourage the practice, since it has no connexion with reason or probability. We trust that coming events will show, that his office-holders' party is an overwhelming democracy; and his wonderful magic, an uncommon portion of public and private virtue.

In the mean time we call on all good democrats, both by word and deed to discourage and rebuke this slander.

It is said, again, that we rely on party names and party machinery for success. But how does this consist with our constant appeal to a sober and enlightened public judgment for the truth of our principles? We use persuasion as a legitimate instrument of influence in all cases, and neither honest men or equitable interest have cause to dread the practice, unless, indeed, they distrust human reason and human justice. The action of mind upon mind in free debate and in open competition is democratic and cannot generate malign influences, like those of artificial rank, of wealth, office or political necromancy. We affirm that the great Democratic party have no hope or desire of success but by the power and truth of their principles. And when it is considered, that by their common position in society, that their interest is the common interest, and that when true to themselves they are of necessity true to the public, the public have the best possible security both for their sincerity and patriotism. Whether the great body of any community may be supposed to lack the necessary wisdom to manage their own concerns, public or private, we will not now inquire.

We cannot suppose, also, that a party courting public observation and scrutiny, should have need to defend itself against mere denunciation and contemptuous appellatives; as ultras, levellers, incendiaries, attempting to found a party on pauperism and crime, so often cast at the democracy. In answer to this we shall only say that the ill success of this most unjust party process upon the principles and policy of our illustrious national Executive is an example, and should be a solemn warning. If the enemies of democracy would effectually destroy it, let them fairly overthrow its principles by appeals to reason. Or if they lack the necessary talent whilst they claim so largely, let them at least be silent. It is not magnanimous to thus pass by the democracy and its principles, and fall personally upon the democrats. It is a practice better suited to that semi-barbarous age when religionists, in a spirited controversy, would stop their ears and cast dirt and stones, than to the present enlightened period. Such practices ever betoken a bad cause.

These remarks, in vindication of our motives and policy as a party, we have felt it our duty to make. But we trust that a further and full vindication will also come from an exposition of our principles of party organization and political action. And in this we shall assume, that the doctrines promulgated by the resolutions of the Democratic Worcester Convention of Sept. 1835, embody the sentiments of the Massachusetts Democracy. The frequent adoption of those resolves formally, on all appropriate occasions by the democracy, their harmony with the general course pursued by the democrats of the last House and Senate, and the general favor manifested by the party towards them, give us this assurance.

The following are the most decisive, and the oftmost cited.

Resolved, That as all sovereignty and government are virtually in the hands of the people, and that the structure of our government and mode of legislation are only designed to give to the will of the people the form and power of law—therefore, to secure the enjoyment of equal laws, it is essential that the people from whom they emanate should be on an equality in their social and political condition.

All combinations, open or secret, all consolidations of wealth or influence, by special laws designed to accumulate power or wealth in large masses for individual good, (the public advantage being only incidental) are subversive of the just equality of the people, and by a necessary consequence, disturb the equality and impartiality of the government and laws.

Resolved, further, that the convention consider that all incorporations of individuals or of capital for private business and profit ought to be uniformly checked and discouraged by the Democracy of this Commonwealth; that they are in the nature of monopolies and aristocratic and with us most apt instruments in the hands of the rich to steal away the rights of the people, and changing, as they do, the equal condition, they in effect change the government also.

Pure Democracy inculcates equal rights—equal laws—and equal means of education—and equal means of wealth also as incident to these blessings.

No man will deny that this is a bold and explicit avowal of party faith, and revealing upon its face an honest purpose. So general and disinterested are its principles that they are incapable of subserving mere private ends.

They have, moreover, the sanction of great names and time-honored usage. They are the doctrines of old Jeffersonian Republicanism before its corruptions, applied to new and ever-varying social exigencies and conditions. They have been fully restored and reduced to practice by our illustrious national Executive, and have well sustained him in his severe struggle against the U. S. Bank, and its kindred money-stock incorporations and monopolies; and his unyielding fidelity to these principles is the main cause of his popularity; and it speaks volumes of the democratic tendency of the great mass of our citizens.

Mr. Van Buren has openly avowed the same sentiments. We quote from his recent letter to Mr. Williams.—“The supremacy of the popular will is the foundation of our government. If we allow it to be prostrated either by corruption or fraud, the republican principle of our system will be broken down. It is only by rigidly and manfully upholding that supremacy on all occasions, that we can hope to resist the perpetual efforts of a spirit inherent in all societies—which has never ceased to maintain a powerful foothold in these states, and which is ever at work to subvert those features of our system, which place the political rights of the people on an equal footing.” These sentiments, as they go, it will be seen are identical with the Worcester resolutions.

And we venture to predict that the measure of Mr. Van Buren's fidelity to them, will be the measure of his popularity. Those who would destroy him and the hopes of the democracy in him, have only to satisfy the people that he is a sectional, partial-special-interest partizan, and a monopolist under the name of democracy. For no man, however talented, can sustain himself before this people, justly laboring under that imputation.

The great mass of men forever occupy the great common position, and therefore must strongly sympathize with the common interest. Self-love itself prompts them to seek their self-elevation, in character and just influence, and their relative equality in society, as a means of common happiness. And thus, what, to pampered, narrow self-conceit, appears criminal jealousy of superiors, and restlessness, in the common mass, is but an effort of nature herself to preserve a common dignity of character. It is the social state alone which furnishes the means of a relative inequality among men. But this inequality is a social disease, and therefore an evil, and it would be strange indeed if a kind Providence had not supplied the elements of a remedy. And it has so done, in this very social jealousy and restlessness, so terrifying to all the children of high fortune. This is the democratic principle, or rather it is nature herself striving in the human heart for human good. And let wise men judge whether these principles are likely soon to be overturned, or whether the doctrines of democracy, as promulgated at the Worcester convention, can be made unpopulous.

In this spirit how much has been applauded, that truly democratic sentiment worthy to be uttered by the voice of a nation, that all men “are born free and equal.” The Worcester Convention, advancing still further by the lights of experience and in tones of equal philanthropy and decision, declare that it is the proper end of a just government to keep men so. Not indeed by any direct efforts at equalization, but in leaving individuals to their own resources, and to nature's own levelling process. So, likewise, equal means of knowledge are wisely deemed essential to our freedom, because knowledge gives power, and literary attainments by our common schools are professed and furnished to all at the public charge; but the Worcester Convention declared also, that equal means of wealth are equally essential for the same end, because wealth gives political consequence and power; and that these means should be sedulously kept open by the government and proffered to all, and not locked up in open or secret combinations, close corporations, and by all the varieties of special legislation now in use. Wealth, to be harmless in our free institutions, should like learning be generally diffused. So a well balanced free government is a great blessing, and the intention seems already perfect in human sagacity—yet it proceeds on the hypothesis that the people are governed, but the Worcester Convention, yet true to the teachings of experience, regard a well balanced community as a far greater good, for then the government is of necessity well balanced, upon the juster theory that the people in effect govern themselves by their agents.

And when, before or since the Worcester Convention, have a people, in this money-loving age, in public assembly, pronounced, that great public or private wealth is not the supreme good of men,—or its culture the first care of a wise and free government, but that, on the contrary, common justice, common virtue, common intelligence, and common equality are far greater national attainments. Thus, in effect, resting our public policy on good morality and the precepts of Christianity itself.

It was wise in the Worcester Convention to recur to the first principles of our social compact. The minds of the citizens are always, in this mode, refreshed, and their patriotism strengthened. It should be the practice of all popular assemblies, as also in our deliberative bodies, and from the period it shall cease, we may date the decline of the republic. They begin with the sovereignty of the people. A sovereignty too, not limited, but full and complete, and which embraces every function of the people's government.

It is history that under the first charter of government of this State, the people actually met in democratic assembly and there pursued the work of self-government. They provided for the common defence, they passed their own laws, administered their own justice, and found no difficulty in enforcing obedience. This was full and complete sovereignty, and constituted all the functions of popular government.

Under our present constitution the theory is the same. The people now, in effect, meet in democratic assembly and govern themselves;—but it is by certain agents appointed and commissioned by the prescribed forms of that constitution, and upon the familiar principle, that what the constituent power or principal, does by its agents, it does itself. The people constitute that constituent power. They declare and promulgate their rules in self-government by the agency of the Legislature, in the form of our Statute laws. They explain and administer those laws to individual exigencies by their judicial agents; and our chief magistrates, the people's executive agents, enforce obedience to the popular will, thus declared and administered by the physical power of the whole community. But, the people, after all, are in truth the only responsible party to the citizen, and to the world. A vast responsibility, indeed, and demonstrates the importance of popular wisdom, virtue, and self-respect.

It is a doctrine universally admitted, that the agent is ever bound by the express or implied will of his constituent, or principal, and this is true in the case before us, as in the ordinary transactions between man and man. This government, then, being a government of the people by agencies, it follows that all the agents, Legislative, Judicial, and Executive, are equally bound by the express or implied popular will. If the people's will is not to be obeyed, they ought not to be responsible for the acts of the government, and in fact they do not govern. But by the constitution, their agents receive the people's instructions in different modes. Senators and Representatives are either expressly or impliedly instructed by the people in all cases. But implied instructions always authorize a sound discretion in the agent; and the agent's acts equally bind the people in either case. Not so, however, if the agent goes beyond a sound discretion or right reason, or is seduced into improper concessions—such acts are void and may be treated accordingly.

The Judge receives the people's instructions through the Statute Book, and they bind him also in all his official duties as far as they go. But there are cases frequently before him, upon which the people in their Statute Book, have given him no orders, or those orders may be ambiguous, and yet common justice requires an action—then, his instructions are necessarily implied, that he shall use a sound discretion, and in obedience he may aid his own judgment by all the lights of judicial learning. But the people should, as far as practicable, pass, by their legislature, all laws which are administered by their judicial agents. This would require a codification of our laws. The executive agency of this government has already been described. The people instruct this agent, also, through the Statute Book, and through the judgments and decrees of the Courts, of which it is the mere minister, or executor.

This, though a concise, is yet deemed to be a correct view of our government. It is simple and intelligible in its theory; and affords the greatest possible security for the rights of the citizens; for unless the people lack either discretion or good temper, or unless even common sense itself shall fail, they will not injure themselves. One thing, however, in a system so wise is remarkable, that the people should not, in their constitution, have reserved to themselves the direct appointment of their Judicial agents; for this agency is as much accountable to the people, as the others, and the people as much accountable for its acts. As it stands now, the Courts are too remote from the principle. And the people feel it. Yet some are even so indiscreet as to insinuate that the judiciary is designed as a barrier to oppose the popular will. Whoever wishes to destroy this institution will say to convince the people that it is above their control, and designed to protect them, against their own worst enemies, themselves.

Such doctrines are far, very far behind the spirit of the age. The common mind is the fountain of good law, as of good politics. In a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their sinister influences neutralized. If public sentiment is correct, the government can hardly be wrong; if incorrect, it is a like conservative spirit it is maintained by the opponents of Democracy, that there is intrinsic strength in the government, aside from the popular will. That by constitutional checks and balances, it becomes a self-purifying, self-regulating, and almost self-perpetuating institution, having a will independent, and even capable of controlling that of the people, when occasion requires. But the Worcester Convention, in the language of democracy, affirm, “that the structure of our government is designed merely to give to the will of the people the form and power of law.” The people will decide between the two theories.

Then, the popular will be here the government, we are to look to the body of the people for all causes disturbing its equity or harmony; and thus the structure of society among us, becomes an object of far greater interest than the structure of the government itself. It is there that different and powerful interests conflict and struggle for preponderance, it is there also they must be balanced, or their



enquiry who is he, what is he, and what are his views? And they look upon all ingenious and indomitable democratic spirits as natural rivals and natural enemies, and they take care in advance to treat them accordingly.

Now can any thinking man fail to discern in all this a strong conservative spirit, and the combining elements of an aristocracy? What is aristocracy, and in fact all artificial settled authority, ever existing among men, but the fixing of the fortunes of a given hour, in the position of power, and by corporate perpetual succession continuing that power to rule the people.

It is always an attempt to counteract nature's favorite law of equal chances to all, for all the good things of this life. Men pampered of fortune, are not content with the personal social power that comes of intelligence and virtue only. This is popularity merely and unstable—they long for perpetuity and the everlasting habitations of influence, and who does not see that from such longings naturally follow combination, and a sympathizing system of politics—and that we must expect that in our present social condition that each succeeding race of fortunes of the given hour, whether of wealth or place, will be struggling to perpetuate their position, and to secure success on the cost of our common free institutions, of our common rights and of those to come after us, reckless of all consequences, and thus constitute a perpetual party. A party which now and since the adoption of our constitution and under all names has been the party of privilege of special legislation, and unjust monopoly.

The Constitution came from the hands of the old patriots a very simple intelligible instrument and based upon a series of truths equally beyond cavil. It was designed to afford a general protection and to administer general laws and only to all under it, to give efficacy to the popular will, and not in the least degree to lead or control it, or exclude its action on all interests and all subjects.

But how soon in the hands of special interest partisans, did the corruptions of constructive and implied powers begin and how vigorously have they been pushed on to this day. It was found that in this mode, special privileges and powers to the favored few might be generated and perpetuated safe from the power of the people; and the constitution instead of protecting common rights might by the magic of construction be made to protect special privilege. And this is aristocracy. And from that time to the present the party have become the sanctioning eulogists of the sacred constitution. Whenever it bleeds and suffers under democratic misrule, they bleed also and answer groan for groan. To expound it in their interests and defend it as expounded they sedulously elevate into highest patriotism—far beyond that which expels invasion, or calms civil hate and strife. But then the constitution they cherish is all abounding in constructive graces, and construed, too by ingenious men in their service and for their special benefit; and to them the commentary is much the better part. It is quite natural, therefore, that they should contend that democratic reading, which makes it a constitution sensitive and responsive only to common influences, to our common wisdom and to the common good. To confer sovereignty on the people's will, instead of opposing it, and to lay bare all interests to the action of that rightful sovereignty and not to raise constructive barriers round special interests to it.

In the same spirit and policy, to establish, nourish and perpetuate unequal fortune is our whole system of associated private wealth, with its accompanying code of corporation laws, and all those legal sophisms of plighted public faith—compacts, irrevocable, under all public exigencies, between the sovereign power and individuals—of sacred vested charter rights elevating the mere fictions of private cupidity, into high contracting parties with the government—as co-equals and as some maintainers of the commonwealth co-workers with it too, for the public good—as if the people governing themselves, can make an agreement with themselves, which themselves cannot alter when their own necessities shall require it—or when such agreements are in derogation of common right!—Can an individual make any valid contract bartering away his natural right to liberty and the free pursuit of the great ends of his being?—Surely not. No more can a self-governing people make valid laws, or grant special privileges, in derogation of our common rights. If they could, the corruptions, mistakes and all unlawful influences of this government be perpetuated through all others, and a worse than hereditary despotism set over us and far beyond our reach. Our general laws when found bad are repealed—how are special laws stronger than general ones? Democrats hold that both must give way before the public good.

If we concede that vested charter rights to property and privileges of any character are effectual against the claims of our common sovereignty itself while seeking the public good, then has the power of wealth already entrenched itself in positions, in this community, where our common government cannot act, and where the power of the people can never come. And what power is that which is above the control of the people; and perpetual too? Call it what you will, it is unnatural and arbitrary, as a settled crown or peerage. And chartered wealth also, is privileged above all other wealth, and charter rights to the things of this world are much holier than those conferred by nature.

Upon this conservative hypothesis the charter rights to banking privileges in this State, resting upon irrevocable compacts, can in no degree be abridged or restrained upon principles of public good, though the whole system should become a public nuisance. Yet a people's legislative agents, we will not say how, or under what dominant influences, have without scruple taken away our natural right to banking advantages—and that too in favor of charter interests. Can the government then abridge natural rights, and multiply those of policy and artificial? So it is denied that the sovereign people can without consent, take, at any time, chartered railways, canals, turnpikes, and bridges, for public uses, at a reasonable price; yet the lands of our farmers, are daily taken without their consent, for a price set by others, and that not for the public, but for these very chartered favorites.

Fellow Citizens: Why is it that our natural rights are held so cheap, and made constantly to give way to the usurpations of personified wealth? It is because the influence of wealth predominate in this community, and has much disturbed our social and political equality. It is because this dominant influence has now possession of our free forms of government, and can pass laws in its own favor, like the Church under the first Charter, and who can deny the justice of the sentiment in the Worcester resolutions, that the system tends to produce an artificial change in our social condition, which ought not to be, for a moment, tolerated by freemen and democrats; and materially hazards the stability of the government.

But this is an exhaustless subject, and we must leave it. Fellow Citizens, it will be readily seen that in the foregoing the Committee present a concise view of democratic principles; and we venture to hope that it will be useful for our electioneering purposes. Could we conciliate all democratic minds among us, by imparting a true knowledge to them of our party faith, we should not doubt the result. In our judgment Massachusetts does not stand before this nation in her true political character. A great majority of her citizens are essentially democratic, and her opposition to the cause of the equal rights of the many, is and has been unnatural and kept up by artificial and most costly means. We believe, therefore, that the best electioneering matter we can address to our fellow-citizens in support of our candidates, VAN BUREN AND JOHNSON, and MORTON AND FOSTER, are the democratic principles, with the assurance that in the election of these men, we shall secure the supremacy of those principles and their practical benefits also in state and nation. Whether we have judged rightly will determine.

By order of the State Committee.

ABEL CUSHING, Ch'm.

The Tremont.—Pit, boxes, slips, and gallery were crowded last night, to welcome Finn, with a "three times three." The pieces went off dashing.

Mr Eaton's Benefit is fixed for Wednesday evening next, when we expect his friends and admirers will make a general turn-out. The house should be brilliantly filled for the young Bostonian, and his heart gladdened, and inspired with new ambition, by the generous support of his fellow-townsmen on this occasion.

How natural.—The Gazette, in giving an account of the conclusion of an interview with a friend, says—"He hastened to the post office, and we went to dinner."

A Jersey Custom.—It is a custom for the inhabitants of the towns around, to come three Saturdays in August for the purpose of bathing in the Raritan river. Black, white and yellow, all go in together with their clothes on, and have a grand time of splashing about.

The Commander of the Texian schooner-of-war Brutus, lying near the Battery, New York, gave an entertainment on Thursday afternoon to Gen. Hunt, of the Texian army, and a large party of ladies and gentlemen.

The Grand Masonic Hall at Lexington, Ky., was burnt down on the 29th ult.

## BOSTON MORNING POST.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1836.

We request the particular attention of our readers for the article written by Colonel Lynch of South Carolina, explanatory of the Hon. Whitmarsh B. Seabrook's conduct at the late Centennial celebration of Harvard University. It clearly convicts the Atlas of a "GRACELESS AND UTTER FALSEHOOD" (to use its own words) in saying that "there was not a syllable that had even the appearance of being founded in fact," in our statement that "the harmony of the dinner part of the ceremony (at Cambridge on Thursday) was interrupted by a speech from Mr Webster." We therefore cast back the foul imputation, and denounce the source from whence it emanated as the fountain of calumny, falsehood, and arraignment.

To the Courier, for the injustice it has done us relative to this business, by intimating that we manufactured an atrocious libel, we look for honorable reparation.

To the Editor of the Boston Morning Post:—

Sir—Yesterday I received a letter from the Hon. Mr Seabrook, of South Carolina, hastily written at Providence, on his way to New York, in which he has requested me to "explain, or vindicate him," from any unworthy suspicions in having retired from the company at the Harvard celebration on Thursday last, immediately at the close of Mr Webster's speech. It is only, sir, in the performance of this duty to a gentleman with whom I hold the same political opinions, that I could be tempted to intrude on the attention of the public; and I therefore solicit its indulgence.

The press of this city having taken notice of the circumstance, although in the first instance Mr Legare was erroneously named instead of Mr Seabrook, the imputation is left with the latter gentleman of having either committed a breach in good manners, or of having been driven from the table by some remark offensive to his feelings. I suppose, sir, it is scarcely necessary that I should explain how South Carolina has been divided into two political parties, each stoutly maintaining its own construction of the Constitution of the United States. Of one of them (the predominant or State Rights party), Mr Seabrook is a conspicuous and popular member. He has possessed, for several years, in a very high degree, the confidence of this party; having been long a Senator in the Legislature of the State, and being at this moment her Lieutenant Governor. His private character is one of unblemished integrity and exceeding amiability; and his pen has been usefully employed at home in promoting the interests of agriculture and humanity; I may, then, with justice and great propriety, say, that such an individual was well entitled to a seat at the celebration.

Mr Webster was brought up by a sentiment from the chair, in which he was most eloquently complimented as the "Defender of the Constitution." The political complexion of it struck me at once, as singularly inappropriate to the place and the occasion; and I felt an instant apprehension that the honorable gentleman might be forced to utter something unpalatable to myself and many other southern men who were present. I was seated on the right hand of my friend, Mr Legare, and so near to Mr Webster that I could distinctly hear even the lowest tones of his voice; and, as it was the first time I had seen or heard him, I listened with the utmost attention. It seemed to me that the sentiment must embarrass him if he should speak up to it, and that he purposely touched it very slightly which greatly increased in my mind the interest he had so immediately awakened.

Parts of his speech were masterly and beautiful; and my gratification would have been perfect, but for the allusion to the State Rights party of South Carolina. In making a very fine and felicitous compliment to Mr Legare, Mr Webster, I thought, conveyed the idea that the State Rights party were the opponents of the Federal Constitution, and that he and his friends had rescued it from the imminent peril of their assaults. I instantly whispered to Mr Legare that he had received a very magnificent compliment, but that Mr Webster had touched me under the fifth rib. Yes, sir, for a moment I winced under it; and it was the same shaft that wounded Mr Seabrook, and drove him from the table, together with a few gentlemen who were immediately around him.

It should be borne in mind that this was the celebration of an aged University—time honored, and illustrious for having given to the Republic some of her most distinguished men. The celebration was announced as purely in honor of literature. It was done with the very atmosphere of the University itself, with whose "wooding breath," the demon of party strife was to have been charmed, and hushed into silence. The city of Boston was crowded with strangers. A large number of them were invited without discrimination of parties; and in an assemblage of two hundred persons it would have been rational to suppose, that there were many present who would be made to feel uneasy by allusions to particular modes of opinion.

Is it, to be wondered at, that a gentleman like Mr Seabrook, holding a high office, the gift of the people of South Carolina; with a political faith founded on principles which he considers to be sound—feeling too the conscious integrity of an honest mind—and sitting in that assembly as the invited guest of the University should have felt deeply offended by the remark of Mr Webster? Sir, it was a most unfortunate occurrence, and has produced what might have been expected, chagrin, and embarrassment to all parties, as must ever happen when explanations are to be made. Every gentleman from South Carolina—every man of delicacy of either party must have felt it in some degree. We sat in that assembly unarmed, and under the canopy of hospitality, which should have shielded the humblest guest, even from the breath of unkindness. But sir, I have done. I trust that I have said enough to exculpate Mr Seabrook from all unjust suspicions of ill-breeding, or capriciousness. He did what every high-minded man would have done in his situation, sitting at that table as an officer, and the faithful public servant of a State, whose escutcheon shows no one blot of dishonor.

Let me not be misunderstood. I acquit Mr Webster of all intention to give pain to any one. In the full fervor of impulsive genius, it is not easy "to check the thunder in mid volley," and for my own particular pain in the affair, the pang was but momentary. Towards Mr Legare, who has been most erroneously, and with unpardonable thoughtlessness brought before the public, and made to say things that he never even imagined, I feel not only respect, but affection—a friend from whom I differ in politics, but on nothing else; and whom I have long and intimately known—let him have praise; for his genius and his acquirements command it—but let it not be given at the expense of Carolina's integrity and devotion to the Constitution of her Fathers.

I am Sir, your humble servt.

JAMES LYNAL.

Tremont House, Sept. 11th, 1836.

N. B. Editors who have commented on the fact referred to, will do an act of justice to Mr Seabrook by republishing the above.

## VERMONT ELECTION.

We received further returns last night which render FLETCHER's election to Congress over James, the present member, certain. This is a glorious triumph, and has broken the heretofore invincible ranks of the Federalists in Vermont. The Vermont Statesman thus announces it:—

### GOOD NEWS FROM THE NORTH!

FLETCHER ELECTED.—We stop the press to announce the glorious fact that in the 5th District, General Fletcher, the Van Buren candidate for Congress, is elected, by about SEVEN HUNDRED MAJORITY, over the present member James I. This gratifying intelligence tells well for the cause of Equal Rights. Fletcher is the first Democrat ever elected to Congress, from this State since the first inauguration of President Jackson.

Horace Everett, the foremost man in the Vermont Federal Congressional Delegation, is, it is thought, defeated in the third district. The Statesman says:—

As far as received the returns are decidedly favorable to Van Buren and Equal Rights. A much heavier vote has been polled this year than last. In this county—one which has ever been the strongest seat of Federalism in the State, where we had but two representatives last year, we have already heard from seven towns in which Van Buren Representatives are elected.

The Vermont Patriot, printed at Montpelier, contains the following intelligence, which shows a great gain on the Democratic side:—

"We are probably beaten on the State ticket by a small majority—a majority so meagre, as only to serve to stimulate every Democrat to renewed exertion. It is the last dying struggle, and the last victory, of the Whig aristocracy, in this State. Waterloo awaits them in November. In 129 towns, the result is, Bradley, (Democrat) 10,613; Jenison, (Whig) 11,689—majority for Jenison, thus far, 1,076. The same towns last year, gave Bradley 8,959; opposition 14,750—majority, 5,791, reducing their majority 4,715. How long can Whiggery keep her head above water, at this rate?"

Our Senators are elected in this county, by nearly 500 majority. In Caledonia, Messrs Palmer and Beckwith are elected handsomely, and it is probable we have succeeded in Orleans, Essex, Grand Isle and Orange, by small majorities, though we cannot speak with much certainty as to the result in any of them. In Orange, for instance, it is thought that Messrs. Jenness, Dickinson and Griswold are elected by less than 100 majority. In Franklin county, though few returns have been received, we apprehend few doubts can be entertained of the entire success of the democratic ticket, though the means of ascertaining what Mr Stone or Mr Sheldon will be one of them. The Whigs have doubtless carried Chittenden, Addison, Windsor, and Rutland. From Windham and Benning we have no intelligence; so that we cannot, at present, determine how the Senate will stand—probably, nearly equal. Next week we shall doubtless be able to impart some more conclusive and satisfactory information to our readers, on most of these points.

Members Elect.—It will be seen from the list of members in another column, that out of 165, we have put down 91 as Democrats, and 76 as either Whigs or Antislavery, as well as opposition. We do not pretend that our list is entirely accurate, but we believe it will not vary much from the truth.

Twelve towns in the 4th District give exactly the same number of votes for each Congressional Representative candidate, Van Ness and Allen—viz: 922.

## LATER FROM SPAIN.

By the arrival of the ship Ariosto, Capt. Blackler, from St Ubes, which port she left on the 19th ult., Messrs Topliss have received a file of the Lisbon English Journal to the 13th ult.—which contains important information relative to the affairs of Spain.

Disturbances still continue in Spain, and it seems now highly probable that the existing government will be overthrown. The constitution of 1822 has been solemnly proclaimed at Cadiz, Seville, and Badajoz, as well as at Malaga. In Seville, on the receipt of a despatch sent to the authorities by the civil government of Cadiz, they called together the superior officers of the National Guard, and made them acquainted with what had occurred at Cadiz, the proclamation of the Constitution of 1812. It was then agreed that all the corps in Seville should be drawn up, in order to ascertain the spirit they were animated with. The result was, that Commissioners were appointed by them, which expressed the following wishes as those of their constituents, viz:—

1st. That the Ministers should be dismissed as well as Gen. Cordova, and a Commander in Chief appointed, worthy of the confidence of the nation.

2d. That a Constituent Cortes be convened upon the principle laid down in the Constitution of 1812, and

3dly, That obedience be no longer paid to the existing Government.

As far as related to the two first articles, the Civil Governor had given way. And as to the third, the open rupture with the existing government, it was still under consideration. We gather from these papers that Madrid is in a state of revolution. The Revista, a Lisbon paper, of Aug. 9, says, that intelligence had been received that a revolution had taken place which caused considerable bloodshed, the result of which was the dismissal of Isaturza, and the appointment of Mendizabal as Prime Minister. The Queen promising to give to Spain a Constitution with two Chambers. This, however, is denied by the Lisbon Journal of the 13th, which says, "we regret to find that M. Mendizabal is not in office, and on the contrary, that the present ministry are continuing their career of mischief anarchy, and have now declared Madrid in a state of siege." One cause of the tumult in Madrid, is said to have been the postponement of the meeting of the Cortes from the 11th to the 15th of August.

Madrid, Aug. 5.—We are assured that the French Ambassador at this Court has declared, that if, in consequence of the insurrectionary movements which have already commenced, the existing fundamental laws should be substituted for the Constitution of 1812, all diplomatic relations will immediately be stopped with the Government at all events, and passports demanded.

Isaturza, the President of the Spanish Ministry, is confined to his bed with a violent inflammatory fever.

These papers contain intelligence of the death of Lieut. General Evans, the Commander of the English Division in the North of Spain. He died from a sickness under which he had been a long time lingering.

Every thing was quiet in Portugal.—Merc. Jour.

Letters from London say that the King is very sick, but that it is not generally known. Victoria is very anxious to be married, and it is believed that when she becomes Queen her government will be very liberal. The Duke of Sussex is her favorite uncle and will probably exercise more influence over her than any one else.

Lady Sykes is the lady who recently had a crim. con. affair with Lord Lyndhurst. The Carlton Club gave £10,000 to stave off the action, as his Lordship would be cast in damages, and his character blown.

The Prince of Capua and his fair bride, Miss Smith, are at Marseilles, having been refused admittance into Italy.

There were seventeen cases of Cholera reported at Charleston, S. C., on the 3d inst., fifteen of which were black persons.

We have before us a letter from Natchez, Miss., by which we learn that Mr Thatcher Cotton, lately of this city, where he transacted business as a dry goods dealer in Dover street, was shot on Saturday evening, July 20th, by a young man in his employ, by the name of Samuel R. Hughes. The particulars, as related in the letter, are, that Hughes, who is said to be a young man of first respectability, had, some weeks previous, a difficulty with Cotton, who threatened to shoot him "at first sight." Hughes consequently armed himself for self-protection, and on Saturday evening, about 9 o'clock, they met on the landing, as Cotton was going on to the hill. It was quite dark, but Hughes observing Cotton in the act of drawing a pistol, fired at him and shot him. Cotton survived about an hour, and Hughes delivered himself up to the proper authorities, was tried and honorably acquitted.—Trans.

Mrs Stirling is said to be the most fascinating actress at London.

## POLICE COURT.

Duffee came to complain against Coffee, for stealing a brooch from himself, and a watch from his friend.

Court—What were you about when the theft happened?

Duffee—I was asleep.

Court—What was your friend about?

Duffee—He was asleep too!

Court—How do you know then that Coffee took your brooch?

Duffee—Because I felt his fingers fumbling about my watch pocket.

Court—Did not you speak to him then?

Duffee—O, yes; says I—What are you after John, me bye?

Court—What did he say in reply?

Duffee—He made answer, Don't be unazy, Henry; for I'm only after a drink.

Court—This you say was when you were asleep?

Duffee—To be sure.

Court—How do you know you were not dreaming?

Duffee—"Caze, when I waked up my brooch was gone.

Court—Have you any witness besides yourself?

Duffee—I don't want any, for his own evidence will convict him, if I can only get him here, and make him confess.

Court—We cannot grant a warrant upon such slight evidence.

Duffee—Its hard—

By-stander—But fair.

George Bliss, was awakened from a blissful trance, by falling head foremost into a cellar. His face was severely smashed by the tumble, and in addition to that misfortune, they took him to the court where they fined him \$3.00 and costs—for falling, perhaps.

Jim Brown stole a hammer—fined \$10.00 and costs—in default of the dust, to hammer stone in the house of Correction one month.

To the New York Sun:—Bright luminary of Gotham, we would advise thee, that the back-sliding Ex-Constable John Reid, of "diamond-pin" immortality, is not that dread terror to evil doers, the veteran and illustrious officer George Reid, nor any akin to him. The celebrated thief catcher always spells his name thus—REID—whereas the pin-fugitive can't spell his name at all. Neither have we in our humble village, such an awful dignity as "High Constable of Boston." In strict accordance with the "Declaration of Independence," our constables are all "created free and equal." The title of High Constable, it is true, has been applied to Veteran Reid, but solely from personal considerations—he being, by some inches, the tallest member of the constabulary; and Heaven forbid, bright Sun, that thou shouldst ever practically learn the difference between the length of thy legs and his. The very thought of it puts us in a tremor, and racks our mind with hideous reminiscences of our early lessons in Algebra.—Ex. gr.—R. moving with the velocity of 8 in an hour, and the Editor 4—the Editor being just a mile in advance—required, how soon will R. nab him?—Ans.—in 15 minutes. Bolts and gratings! what an uncomfortable suggestion!

The Mechanic Rifle Corps looked splendidly yesterday—it is a first rate company. Eaton dined them in magnificent style.

The lower buildings connected with the iron works belonging to the Messrs Parker, in Wareham, were burnt down on Friday night.

For the Boston Morning Post.

Mr Greene.—As various erroneous statements have been made in several newspapers, respecting the Roxbury Town Meeting, I propose, with your leave, to make a few plain remarks in reply to some of them. It is stated in a city paper, that the sentiments of the people upon the question of granting licences "was fairly tested at the choice of County Commissioners two years ago, by the election of the temperance ticket, by a large majority—notwithstanding the most zealous and determined opposition." At the election referred to, the views of the County Commissioners with respect to licences, were unknown and unthought of by the voters, no temperance ticket (so called) was known, except to a few, who did not think proper to disclose its object. So far were the voters of Roxbury from apprehending the intended course of the County Commissioners, which even now is felt to affect injuriously the trade of the town, and which cannot but depreciate the value of every species of property in it—so great an indifference was shown at that election that there were only about one hundred in all, and yet the number of voters in Roxbury is nine or ten hundred. These facts do not agree with the assertion that a "zealous and determined opposition" was shown, or that the intention of the County Commissioners was even suspected by the people.

At the recent town meeting in Roxbury, as is very well known, the Town Hall was crowded with citizens; probably nearly all the adult male members of the Roxbury Temperance Society were there, and, whatever might have been their numbers, it is believed that if every person in that Hall, opposed to the resolutions, had voted, there would not have been fifty votes against the resolutions. It is known that many members of that society disapprove entirely of their recent proceedings, and very wisely prefer to keep within the bounds which a prudent forethought and a just regard for the rights of their fellow-men suggest. Yet we are told in one of the papers, as if it were to have a great effect, that the "friends of temperance" declined voting—meaning the members of the temperance society. And here it may be remarked, that several writers have assumed the position that none are friends of temperance but the members of temperance societies. Nothing can be more arrogant and untrue; it is absurd, and as offensive to good manners as it is to good sense.

It is undoubtedly true, as stated by a writer commenting upon the proceedings of the Roxbury town meeting, that, "until the article [ardent spirit] is entirely banished from the country, it will continue to be sold and used, in spite of all that can be done to prevent it by legislation."

This writer surely cannot be uninformed, scarcely can any man be, of the indispensable necessity of this article in various branches of the arts and in medicine, which render it as certain as any future event can be, that it never will be "banished from the country." As it follows then, that the article will continue to be sold and used, and that legislation cannot and ought not to prevent it, the only question with regard to it, which the true friends of temperance can consider with any reasonable hope of a profitable result to their labors, is how to prevent an intemperate use of it, and as far as may be, avoiding all intemperate zeal in a good cause, endeavor to persuade the risen and the rising generation to abstain from the use of it. It is well known, and acknowledged with much gratification, that Temperance Societies in this country have done much good, and this result of their useful labors has been the natural consequence of the judicious means, argument, and persuasion, which they have employed. But if, instead of using these legitimate instruments, they should resort to compulsory measures and resolve themselves into courts of inquisition to sit in judgement upon such of their fellow-men as differ with them in opinion, and presume to set up a standard of morality which neither religion nor common sense nor common honesty can sanction, the cause of Temperance would be thrown back to its starting point, and the conscientious and disinterested members of the society, who have no view to office or emolument, no desire to build up a reputation of superior purity upon any other foundation than that of a well-spent life—these members would then see with regret that the conduct of their cause had been entrusted to weak hands.

ROXBURY.

The reader's attention is directed to the Address from the Democratic State Committee published in this paper.

Attempt to Steal Santa Anna.—A schooner arrived at New York from Brazoria, reports that the sch. Passaic, Hughes, from New York for Galveston, had been seized for having on board several persons from New Orleans, who made an attempt to steal Santa Anna, and take him to Mexico in said vessel; the persons were arrested and imprisoned before their plans were properly matured.

DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CONVENTION.—The Democrats of the several towns in Middlesex county, are requested to choose many Delegates to attend a Convention to be held at Smith's Tavern, on Wednesday, the 21st of September next, at 11 o'clock, A. M. for the purpose of nominating a list of Senators for said county, and transacting such other business as may come before them. The Democrats in the several towns in District No. 4, are also requested to choose Delegates to meet at the same place and day, at 10 o'clock, A. M. to nominate a candidate for Representative to Congress for said District. By order of the County Committee.

37 COUNTY CONVENTION.—The Democratic Convention of the Roxbury Congressional and Senatorial District, are requested to send Delegates to meet in Convention, at Wilson's Coffee-House, in Lenox, on MONDAY, the 19th day of September next, at 1 o'clock, P. M. for the purpose of nominating a candidate for Member of Congress and Senators for the Berkshire District, and also to agree upon a list of Electors of President and Vice President of the United States, to be supported at the election in November next. Early notice is given, in order that there may be a general representation from every part of the District. By order of the County Committee. August 27, 1836.

TAKE NOTICE.—The Democratic Republicans, friendly to the election of Martin Van Buren for President, residing in the several towns composing the Ninth Congressional District, are requested to send Delegates equal to the number of Representatives they are entitled to send to the General Court, to meet in Convention at Clark's Tavern, on WEDNESDAY, the 23rd day of October next, at 11 o'clock, A. M. to select a candidate for Representative to Congress, and to transact the ordinary annual business. The several towns in the District are requested to send as many Delegates as they are entitled to Representatives in the General Court. By order of the District Committee.

NOTICE.—THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICANS OF DISTRICT NO. 3, are hereby notified that a Convention will be held at WELDON'S HOTEL, ANDOVER, South Parish, on WEDNESDAY, the 5th day of October next, at 11 o'clock, A. M. to select a candidate for Representative to Congress, and to transact the ordinary annual business. The several towns in the District are requested to send as many Delegates as they are entitled to Representatives in the General Court. By order of the District Committee.

DISTRICT NO. 2.—The Democratic Republicans in the Second Congressional District, friendly to the election of Martin Van Buren, will hold a Convention in the Rooms of the Jackson Association, Salem, on Wednesday, the 5th of October next, at 11 o'clock, A. M. for the purpose of nominating a candidate for member of Congress, and a list of Electors. The several towns in the District are requested to send as many Delegates as they are entitled to Representatives in the General Court. By order of the District Committee.

NORTHERN DEBATING SOCIETY.—The Northern Debating Society will hold their first meeting for the season, on FRIDAY EVENING next, at 7½ o'clock, at the Vestry of the Rev. Mr. Robbins's Church, Hanover st. The address will be delivered by Francis Hamilton, Esq.; the Poem by Lewis Joseph, Esq. To this meeting each member is entitled to three tickets, which can be obtained at the store of Mr Charles French, No 181 Hanover st. JOHN C. PRATT, Secy.

IMPORTATIONS.

ROTTERDAM. Brig Elizabeth—220 pipes gin—177 kegs nunges—176 casks lined oil—3 kegs tannets—422 cases glass—3 kegs refined camphor—3 kegs mace—4 kegs 2 bales indigo—89 bags clover seed—10 cases oil cloth—20 tubs camphor—30 bags mustard seed—30 kegs barley—4 cases cognac—4 do toys—2 casks brandy—1 bale woollens—2 cases shoes—76 cases madder.

TRINIDAD. Bark Franklin—474 casks 25 bales molasses—192 boxes Muscovado sugar—127 boxes white, 113 do brown sugar.

ST. URES. Ship Ariosto—650 mays salt—Jars grapes.

ST. JOHN, NB. Sch Agenria—115 tons plaster.

MINIATURE ALMANAC—Tuesday, Sept. 13, 1836.

Rises, Sets, MOON, FULL SEA, Temp. in 1835, at, and, 58, 69.

SHIP-NEWS—BOSTON, 1836.

MONDAY, Sept. 12—ARRIVED.

Ship Ariosto, Blacker, St Ubes, 19th Aug. Left ship Nestor, Size, Portsmouth, 6 days; Brigs Aquila, Boardman, do do; Clarissa Ann, for Bath, next day. Sailed in co with ship John Hale, Crowell, for Portsmouth. 3d inst, lat 41, lon 49.40, passed the hull of a vessel, (a ship or bark), apparently from South America, even with water's edge, bulwarks, &c. gone—had a broad white moulding across the stern, but no carved work—about 40 feet of the main-mast remained standing. 10th, lat 42.40, lon 67, spoke sch. Herald, of Plymouth, fm Grand Bank, as a head wind.

Bark Franklin, Gibbs, Trinidad, 14th ult. Left bark Madeline, for Philadelphia, 2 days; brigs Patron, Blechnam, Boston do; Cordelia, Clapp, hence, just arr; Ajax, Theobald, fm Wiscasset, disg.

Brig Eleuth, Long, Rotterdam 5th, Helvoet 29th July.

Spoke, Aug 11th, lat 50; lon 17.46, bark Albion, 28 days fm Quebec for London.

Br sch Caroline, Crosseup, Digby—25 cts wood.

Sch Cordelia, Baker, Philadelphia, 10th inst.

Sch Lexington, Wheeler, New York.

Signal for a ship.

CLEARED.

Brigs Globe, Ellwell, Bordeaux; Favorite, (Br) Card, Windj sor; Nelson, Mabce, Eastport; sch Rolia, Boone Ryder, Jacmel; Br schs Lark, Card, Windsor; Ben, Forest, Halifax; Adams, Forest, Archib; Edwin, Goodwin, Digby; Experiment, Jague, for do; schs Mary Ann, Harding, and Napoleon, Jones, Washington, NC







1990